

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 15 2007

REMARKS

In a response dated November 1, 2006, the Applicants (in the claims section) cancelled claims 1-32 and 44-71 thereby leaving claims 33-43 pending. In the remarks section, however, the Applicants indicated that claims 25-43 were being pursued as was subsequently noted by the Examiner in the aforementioned *Office Communication*.

The Applicants, in fact, meant to cancel all claims *except* claims 25-32, which the Examiner had previously identified as allowable subject matter. As such, the Applicants present the current *Response* wherein claim 1-24 and 33-71 are indicated as having been cancelled. Through this cancellation, only claims 25-32 remain pending. Further, the Applicants hereby definitively indicate that they wish to pursue claims 25-32, which have been identified as allowable over the cited art of record. The Applicants believe the present amendment and remarks remedy the Examiner's query as set forth in the aforementioned *Communication*.

The Applicants remind the Examiner of the request for correction of inventorship under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) as presented on page 5 of the Applicants' November 1, 2006 amendment. The fee for that petition has previously been processed and the Applicants would appreciate affirmative confirmation of the correction of inventorship in the present application (as a result of cancellation of claims) such that Glen McLaughlin and Ting-Lan Ji remain the joint inventors for the present matter.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 15 2007

CONCLUSION

The Applicants believe that the cancellation of all rejected claims leaves only allowable subject matter pending in the present application. As such, the Applicants believe the application to be in condition for allowance.

The Applicants further believe the request for the deletion of inventor David Napolitano to be proper and request his name be struck as an inventor for the present application.

The Applicants expressly reserve the right to pursue any presently cancelled claim in a subsequent continuation application. Any cancellation presented in the current amendment should not be construed as concurrence with the Examiner's basis for rejection but a means as to expedite allowance of the present application.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative with any questions concerning the present application.

Respectfully submitted,
Glen McLaughlin et al.

February 15, 2007

By:

Kenneth M. Kaslow
Kenneth M. Kaslow (Reg. No. 32,246)
Carr & Ferrell LLP
2200 Geng Road
Palo Alto, CA 94303
P: 650.812.3400
F: 650.812.3444